the protection of public gardens and parks.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR replied that he did not doubt the statement of the Government and that was why he had said at the outset that he would not impute any motives to this legislation. But his main point was that though the heart of the Government with regard to this measure was good, the path which they had selected was wrong. Supposing a meeting was held in an open ground, somebody might come and say that that place was declared as a public park and that therefore the meeting should not be held there. That was why he did not like the bill in question. After all, no damage was being done to the beautiful parks in the two cities. People had sense enough to realize the value of gardens and parks. Government should not therefore think that in the absence of a special law for the protection of gardens, people would seriously interfere with or damage them. He would say that as between State subjects and public parks, the State should certainly attach greater value to its subjects than to its gardens. In this view, there would be no justification for the Government to place any unnecessary restrictions on the subjects in their anxiety to protect parks. The proposed law was sure to cause great hardship to the people. Such an apprehension would not probably have been entertained by members if the times had been normal, and if the cordial relationship between the Government and the public had not been disturbed as at present. And this was hardly the time for the Government to think of such special laws.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI said that similar rules were in force in the Calcutta Gardens and he did not see any reason why anybody should entertain any kind of apprehension about them.

Mr. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR requested Government not to copy such laws from outside. After all, parks had not come into existence in Mysore only to-day. There were beautiful parks and gardens in existence even from the days of Tippu Sultan. And one of the features which had contributed to the reputation of Mysore was her famous gardens and parks. Mysore City itself was known as the Garden City of India, and the fact that such gardens had not been damaged by the public in the past showed that the generality of the public had realized the value of such gardens. There was no reason for the Government to think that in future parks or gardens might be damaged if the law as proposed was not enacted. For these reasons, he requested the Government not to proceed with this legislation.

At 5-5 p.m., the House rose for the day to meet again at 12 of the clock on Monday, 13th June 1938.

THIRD DAY.

Monday, 13th June 1938.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Monday, 13th June 1938, at 12 of the clock, *Rajamantrapravina* S. P. Rajagopalachari, First Member of Council, in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Reduction of Court Fees.

Q.—18. **Mr. A. G. MUDDARACHAPPA**, Bowringpet Municipality,—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) when the schedule of court fees was raised by the Government from Rs. 7½ to Rs. 10;

(*b*) the annual revenue realized since the enhancement of the above rate;

(*c*) the annual realizations when the rate was Rs. 7-8-0;

(*d*) the amount of stamp duty realized during the last 5 years (figures to be furnished yearwar);

(*e*) the difference in the realization of stamp revenue before and after the enhancement of the aforesaid rate?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. H. V. Ramasvami).—

				Rs.	a.	p.
(*a*) From the 1st of February 1923.						
(*b*) For the year	1923-24	...	...	10,31,584	10	10
,,	1924-25	...	...	10,45,580	8	2
,,	1925-26	...	...	11,25,311	15	10
,,	1926-27	...	...	10,74,441	1	6
,,	1927-28	...	...	12,22,796	0	11
,,	1928-29	...	...	11,98,646	5	10
,,	1929-30	...	..	11,57,478	3	1
,,	1930-31	...	...	11,45,008	7	8
,,	1931-32	...	...	12,36,752	4	10
,,	1932-33	...	...	13,30,504	9	2
,,	1933-34	...	...	11,27,447	8	5
,,	1934-35	...	...	11,15,514	11	0
,,	1935-36	...	...	11,77,686	3	6
,,	1936-37	...	...	11,80,984	9	3

			Rs.	a.	p.
(*c*) For 5 years previous to 1922-23—					
	1917-18	...	6,19,256	12	4
	1918-19	...	6,76,052	10	6
	1919-20	...	7,87,214	9	3
	1920-21	...	7,81,647	11	10
	1921-22	...	8,41,625	3	7
	Total	...	37,05,796	15	6

(*d*) Rs. 59,32,137-9-4.

Please *see* answer to question (*b*) for yearwar figures (1932-33 to 1936-37).

(*e*) Please *see* answers to questions (*b*) and (*c*).

Mr. A. G. MUDDARACHAPPA.—What were the reasons for which the schedule of fees was enhanced from 7½ per cent to 10 per cent?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—The enhancement of rates was ordered several years back. The reasons must have been gone into when that was done.

Mr. A. G. MUDDARACHAPPA.—Do the Government agree that if the rates are reduced to Rs. 7-8-0 a larger revenue is likely to be derived?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—We cannot say that.

Mr. A. G. MUDDARACHAPPA.—Will they try it as a matter of experiment at least?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Government do not see any reason to reduce the rates at present.

Mr. A. G. MUDDARACHAPPA.—Are not the existing rates weighing as a heavy burden on the raiyats?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—No.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHY ACHAR.—The Government are trying to help the raiyats by passing measures like the Debt Conciliation Act. Do they not think that reducing the schedule of court fees will be one more method of helping them?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—For helping the raiyats many other measures have been undertaken.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Is it not a fact that the *ad valorem* duty has been fixed only at 7½ per cent in the Civil and Military Station, Bangalore, whereas the rate in the Bangalore City is as high as 10 per cent?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—It may be.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—The rates were enhanced only as a temporary measure on account of financial stringency. Now that there is a surplus budget, why should not the Government think of reducing the rates to the old level?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—The rates have come to stay having been in force for a long period of 15 years. Besides, the question of lowering the rates did not come up for consideration

when the budget estimates now before the House were prepared. If the rates are reduced at present, the result will be a loss of revenue to the extent of Rs. 4 lakhs. Government cannot afford to forgo such a large sum.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Will the Government consider this question favourably at least when the budget for the next year is considered?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I cannot say that at present.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Do the Government agree that the income they derive from courts of law is much more than the expenditure they have to incur on their account?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—The figures relating to expenditure on courts are not before me just now. I want notice.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—If the Government find that the revenue is more than the expenditure, will they consider the question of reducing the rates to a corresponding extent?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Government cannot accept that principle.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Do the Government think then that there are administrations which derive a profit from the administration of justice?

Mr. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—The rates are fixed with reference to certain principles. If as a result of those rates, Government derive some extra revenue, why should they forgo it? There is nothing immoral about it.

Recovery of Initial Deposits for Housing Installations.

Q.—19. **Mr. A. G. MUDDARACHAPPA, Bowringpet Municipality.**—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) when were orders passed prescribing certain deposits to be made before supplying electric energy to houses, factories and pumps, etc.;

(*b*) the amount so far deposited since the date of passing these orders;

(*c*) whether any interest is being paid to the depositors on such amount;

(*d*) when the amount would be returned to the depositors;

(*e*) whether any time limit is prescribed for returning such deposits;

(*f*) if not, the method adopted for returning such deposits?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT (Diwan Bahadur N. N. Ayyangar).**—

(*a*) From the inception of the power supply scheme, the recovery of the two months' minimum deposits has been prescribed in the case of house lighting. This compliance is insisted upon from the owners of lighting installations also since March 1934.

A deposit of Rs. 40 or two months' minimum deposit, calculated on the basis of a 50 per cent load factor, is required of those power installation consumers rated at 10 H. P. or less only. Installations above 10 H. P are exempted from this deposit.

The owners of irrigation pumps are required to deposit one year's revenue at 5 per cent on the estimated capital cost if the capital investment exceeds rupees one thousand, and six months' revenue at the same percentage in other cases with effect from 1st July 1936.

(*b*) The total amount of deposits received up-to-date from consumers of house lighting power installations and irrigation pumps amount to Rs. 1,51,992-6-9 at the end of April 1938.

(*c*) No interest is being paid on account of these deposits as the great majority of them are very small, ranging from Re. 3-6-0 to Rs. 20 or Rs. 25.

(*d*) The deposits are returned to the depositors immediately they cease to take power and on receipt of application after adjusting all amounts due from them on account of their consumptions.

(*e*) No.

(*f*) Please *see* answer to (*d*) above.

Mr. A. G. MUDDARACHAPPA.—Government say that the system of insisting on the recovery of two months' minimum charges as initial deposit has been long in existence. Are the Government sure that there are no exceptions to this rule?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—Not that I am aware of.